



CCR Education Sub-Workgroup Meeting

January 17, 2017

Meeting Notes

744 P St., Sacramento, CA 95814, OB9 Room 204

Purpose: To discuss how education system (the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA), Foster Youth Services and General Education) interplays with Child Welfare, Probation and Mental Health systems in the implementation of CCR.

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. Welcome and Introductions Stuart Oppenheim , Child and Family Policy Institute of California (CFPIC)/ Ahmed Nemr , California Department of Social Services (CDSS)	Participants: (in-person and via phone) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breaking Barriers: Maureen Burness; • CA Dept. of Education: Alejandro Espinoza, Lisa Guillen; • California Behavioral Health Directors Association (CBHDA): Kim Suderman; • CDSS: Ahmed Nemr, Sara Rogers, Rebecca Buchmiller, Theresa Thurmond, Tracy Urban, Alma Lopez; Marjana Jackson, Mai Yer Vang, Sara Davis, Gina Jones, Fantoya Hill; • CFPIC: Stuart Oppenheim; • Los Angeles Department of Children and Family Services : Patricia Armani; • Madera County Human Services: Danny Morris; • LA County MH: Robert Byrd; • Probation: Ruda Lester, • Fresno County: Tricia Gonzalez • SB County: Villarreal Francesca, • Health & Human Services Agency, SD: Melinda Verbon; • Sacramento County: Cynthia Vanzant; • SELPA: Karen Coleman, Sam Neustadt, Conde Kunzman, Mindy Fattig, Benay Loftus, Veronica Coates, Allen Deanna, Elinsky Lori-Anne, Kessler Alice, Jim Voss, Roy Applegate, 	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<p>II. CCR Updates – Sara Rogers, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A question was asked if the Licensing Program Analyst should be required to ask what the child’s school of origin is when they go out to do the initial interview with the child. Can this question be inserted on the document the Licensing Program Analyst (LPA) uses? • A column inserted for the provider to document if there is a non-public school near their facility. • A discussion around how services will be provided if the child is in school all day (accessibility to the child) is warranted. • It was suggested that it should be mandatory that the Child and Family Team (CFT) has someone from Education present early on in the meetings. According to Education code 1656? SELPA must be notified. • California Department of Education (CDE) is currently working with Department of Finance (DOF) regarding funding. SELPA is encouraged to reach out to CDE to be included in the discussions regarding funding. • CDSS encourages cross collaboration between Probation, Social Workers, etc. regarding STRTPs, etc. • The Interim Licensing Standards (ILS) for Short-Term Residential Program’s (STRTP) have been released. There are eight existing applications and most Group Homes have applied for extensions at this time. It is anticipated a large number of GHs will be in the extension process for the remainder of this year. • At the end of the year there can be another extension request in order to receive a Title IV-E rate. Group homes will not be eligible for Foster Care payments if they do not have an extension or STRTP approval but will be able to continue to be licensed and to operate to support other placements. • A discussion around difference between the GH and the STRTP model. It is policy and programmatic view that residential placements should be short-term while working to move child/youth into family based care. There will be other services to support children in home based care such as Therapeutic Foster Care, Intensive Treatment Foster Care and other. • Discussion around Mental Health Services and Youth Placed in STRTP. The question was asked “Will Education place in STRTP’s and Group Homes? STRTP’s children must meet the STRTP placement requirement as decided by IPC. • Placements are made for six months. Continued CW placement beyond six months must be approved by county CW director and continued probation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to build in a requirement that someone from Education contacts the receiving educational entity to notify them that the child is coming into the county. Need to know who holds the educational rights of that child. A suggestion was to insert this language in the draft CDSS ACL regarding IPC.

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>placement beyond twelve months must be approved by chief probation officer.</p> <p>Q: What is the plan if the placing agency cannot find a home?</p> <p>A: Counties are working to collaborate with providers to find a solution for each child.</p> <p>Q: Education only recommends places when it is necessary for educational purposes. There are approximately 1000 children statewide which is not enough to sustain the group homes across the state; if STRTP rates include medical/psychiatric services then Education cannot place there.</p> <p>A: The foster care rate is not bundled with medical/psychiatric services; these require separate contract with Mental Health. CDSS only wants youth in congregate care who have therapeutic mental health needs, but the question is should Education have the same perspective? If a child needs residential placement in order to benefit from education, but does not need mental health services then they should not be in an STRTP. Education agrees that children who do not need mental health therapeutic services should not be in an STRTP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provider must be capable of providing specialty mental health services for children as needed. The services are Medi-Cal services and require eligibility for M/C or will need to be paid for by another source. • There is a problem with providers who will not take CWS and Probation placements unless they are certified as needing Non-Public School (NPS). There is a need to assure that this will not create issues for the children. • Education requires that children be placed as close to school of origin. <p>Q: Does STRTP situation apply to children who are adopted?</p> <p>A: Yes</p> <p>Q: Should/could adoptions be included in the IPC's?</p> <p>A: This is something that CDSS is aware of and is assessing. This will ultimately need to be addressed at the local level.</p> <p>Q: What is supply of beds vs. demand right now?</p> <p>A: CDSS will be meeting with placing agencies to estimate the number of STRTP beds that they will need and then will try to work with the providers and counties to meet capacity through converting some existing providers to meeting other needs in the continuum of care.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placements can only be paid for in placements with non-public schools that are certified by CDE. Are there changes to CDE certification necessitated by a provider moving from being a GH to being an STRTP? CDSS will follow-up with CDE for clarification. • CDSS has a comprehensive list of GH providers---will add columns to account for NPS so that the NPS situation can be addressed. • Should there be a requirement that the IPC in sending county contact the SELPA in receiving county for children being placed across county lines and provide specific information. This can be incorporated into the IPC ACL that is in development.

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<p>III. – Lisa Guillen, Foster Youth Services</p>	<p>Lisa provided an overview of Foster Youth Services (FYS) and a discussion of opportunities for interface. The discussion included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For every placement change, a youth will lose about 6 month of learning. • AB 854 changed the model from direct service to resource leveraging model. • Need to build the capacity of Education community to work collaboratively with other agencies to enhance resources and services to youth. • “Every Student Succeeds Act” (2015) effective 12/10/16, increases collaboration, increases capacity. It is mandated to work together. • 30% of foster youth have IEPs. Many, many more need case management even if they do not need IEP services. • Need for an infrastructure for non-IEP student. A uniform and standardized way to meet the needs. • Per Legislation in 2013 there is new funding formulas for education and enhanced funding for school districts. Expanded FYS to families, beyond group home placements as there is one FY to be served and therefore expanded the model and the funding levels, along with increased accountability at the local level. There is a shift from direct service provider to capacity building in collaboration with partners. • County Offices want to be more involved with the agencies. Legislation requires creation of Executive Advisory Council for each County Office to include collaborative agencies—hopefully including Child Welfare. <p>Q: How can FYS help support CFT’s? CDE has a growing recognition that high-needs children who do not have IEP’s need services that FYS can provide-this may be an avenue to address the need to support CFT’s?</p> <p>Q: Does the Education community have enough information about CCR?</p> <p>A: There is a list of FYS Coordinators to share this information with the Councils.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that FYS be invited to the State/County team. • Lisa to send Ahmed document regarding Multi-agency information sharing. Issued by DOJ but information included in ACIN 16-81. • For CCR—can we look at the new role of FYS with CFTs’, with licensing? CDE would like to help with the development of standardization at the local level and wants to figure out where the opportunities are for increased information sharing and collaboration? • It was requested this matter be added to the State/County Team and possibly the RITE meeting agendas.
<p>IV. CFT/IEP SMALL WORKGROUP REPORT OUT Caroline Caton, CDSS/ Veronica Coates, SELPA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the CFT/IEP matrix that was developed by the CCR Ed Small Workgroup was provided to help understand where CFT and IEP processes align and or intersect. The matrix lays out key aspects of each process with statutory references. • It was noted that general education should be included to build onto the matrix, along with FYS. Using the matrix as a starting point for further discussion with other parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should IEP section be a subset of a more general education section? • Lisa will get some names to Ahmed for the next meeting to include in the conversation

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group agreed that there should be more expansive conversations about Education in general (beyond Special Ed) at this workgroup. The following are agencies whom should be included in subsequent meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDS and FYS Coordinators County Office Early Childhood Coordinators Alternative Education—ask through County Superintendents Association Local District representatives Developmentally Disabled Services CDE Child Services Division Local school district representation (there are 1800 local districts). County Offices want to be more involved with the agencies. Legislation requires creation of Executive Advisory Council for each County Office to include collaborative agencies which should include Child Welfare. For CCR is it possible to look at the new role of FYS with CFTs' and with licensing? CDE would like to help with the development of standardization at the local level and figure out where the opportunities are for increased information sharing and collaboration? How can FYS help support CFT's? There is a growing recognition that high-needs children who don't have IEP's do need services that FYS can provide. Concern brought up that the Education community may be lacking information about CCR. Consider the use of Executive Advisory Councils. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing county reps will identify some individuals. Benay Loftus will identify some individuals. Trish Kennedy and Joan Davidson from Sacramento County for the preschool population.
V. CCR EDUCATION SUB-WORKGROUP DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those in attendance agreed to wait to invite other stakeholders, advocates and providers for now. 	
VI. Next Steps Stuart Oppenheim, CFPIC Ahmed Nemr, CDSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next meeting February 28, 2017. 10:00-3:00, CDSS, OB8/Room 1031 Identify FYS and General Ed and other Ed partners to invite to next meeting Plan agenda to build on the IEP/CFT matrix to make it pertinent to all of Education Hold conversation on NPS and provider participation until a future meeting 	